



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/066,627	02/06/2002	Hitoshi Kato	33082M119	4442

441 7590 01/03/2003

SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP  
1850 M STREET, N.W., SUITE 800  
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

GUERRERO, MARIA F

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2822

DATE MAILED: 01/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/066,627

Applicant(s)

KATO ET AL.

Examiner

Maria Guerrero

Art Unit

2822

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 November 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-3 and 7-12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 February 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is in response to the Election filed November 7, 2002.

Claims 1-12 are pending.

***Election/Restrictions***

2. Applicant's election of Species I (claims 4-6) in Paper No. 4 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claims 1-3 and 7-12 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 4.

***Priority***

3. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

***Specification***

4. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

***Drawings***

5. Figure 6 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hey et al. (U.S. 5,482,739) in view of R.C. Taylor et al. "LPCVD of Silicon Nitride Films From Hexachlorodisilane and Ammonia"

Regarding claims 4-6, Hey et al. teaches placing a workpiece (substrate) in a reaction vessel, forming a silicon nitride film on the workpiece, heating the reaction vessel, and exhausting gas from the reaction vessel through an exhaust pipe connected to the reaction vessel (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 1-20, 50-60, col. 3, lines 48-67). Hey et al. discloses heating the exhaust pipe at a temperature of about 80° to 250° C (capable of gasifying ammonium chloride) and more preferably from about 100° to 170°C to avoid deposition the ammonium chloride condensate (Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 10-25).

Hey et al. does not specifically show supplying hexachlorodisilane into the reaction vessel. However, Hey et al. shows supplying dichlorosilane and ammonia to the reaction vessel (col. 3, lines 5-10, col. 4, lines 45-50). Furthermore, Taylor et al. teaches using hexachlorodisilane as an alternative to dichlorosilane for forming silicon nitride films. Taylor et al. discloses that the growth rates are substantially higher than those obtained from dichlorosilane under similar conditions and dichlorosilane is less hazardous precursor than dichlorosilane (pages 319-323).

Since Hey et al. and Taylor et al. are both from the same field of the endeavor of forming silicon nitride films, the purpose disclosed by Taylor et al. would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Hey et al. The combination implicitly teaches heating the reaction chamber at a temperature capable of decomposing hexachlorodisilane by thermal decomposition because this is required in order to form the silicon nitride film.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hey et al. reference by replacing dichlorosilane by hexachlorodisilane as taught Taylor et al. The modification would provide a process of forming a good quality silicon nitride film at higher growth rates and with a less hazardous precursor. (Taylor et al., pages 319, 323).

Furthermore, in the case where the claimed ranges "overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art" a prima facie case of obviousness exists. In re Wertheim, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976); In re Woodruff, 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

**Conclusion**

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Jammy et al. (U.S. 6,268,299), Saida et al. (U.S. 6,284,583), Tanaka et al. (U.S. 6,333,547), and Tanaka et al. "Film Properties of Low-k Silicon nitride Films formed by Hexachlorodisilane and Ammonia" disclose employing hexachlorodisilane and ammonia to form silicon nitride films. Saito (U.S. 6,159,298) teaches heating the exhaust pipe at 150o C to avoid adhesion of the ammonium chloride.
8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maria Guerrero whose telephone number is 703-305-0162.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amir Zarabian can be reached on 703-308-49055. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

*Maria Guerrero*  
Maria Guerrero  
Patent Examiner  
December 27, 2002